2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

v.

in this case April 10, 2008, the original hearing date for Defendant's Motion to Dismiss was vacated and ordered to be rescheduled before the Honorable Maxine M. Chesney. Therefore, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on May 23, 2008 at 9:00

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULED MOTION TO DISMISS

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

a.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in Courtroom 7, 19th Floor of the above-entitled court located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102, Defendant BARCLAYS CAPITAL REAL ESTATE, INC. dba HOMEQ SERVICING, erroneously sued herein as HOMEQ SERVICING INC. ("Homeq"), will and hereby does move the Court to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice.

The motion is brought pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim for relief against Defendant. The motion will be based upon this notice of motion, the previously filed memorandum of points and authorities, all pleadings and documents filed herein, and any argument that may be presented or any matters of which judicial notice is requested or proper.

DATED: April 4, 2008

HOUSER & ALLISON A Professional Corporation

By: By: /s/ Jeffrey S. Allison

Eric D. Houser Jeffrey S. Allison Attorneys for Defendant BARCLAYS CAPITAL REAL ESTATE, INC. dba HOMEQ SERVICING, erroneously sued herein as HOMEO SERVICING INC.

3

5

4

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

24

2526

27

28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within action. My business address is 9970 Research Drive, Irvine, California 92618.

On April 11, 2008, I served the following document described as:

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULED HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

On the following interested parties in this action:

Shawn Ridgell RIDGELL & LAWLOR LLP 2128 Broadway Oakland, CA 94612 (510) 986-1300

[X] VIA MAIL -- By placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope(s) addressed as above, and placing each for collection and mailing on the date following ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with my firm's business practice and collection and processing of mail with the United States Postal Service and correspondence placed for collection and mailing would be deposited with the United States Postal Service at Irvine, California, with postage thereon fully prepaid that same day in the ordinary course of business.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on April 11, 2008, at Irvine, California.

Sherie L. Cleeré

- 1. Plaintiff fails to state a claim of relief for negligent interference with prospective economic advantage. The complaint does not allege any actual business or economic relationship, nor does it allege any economic relationship with the owner of the property. Further, Plaintiff does not and cannot allege Homeq knew of his purported business relationship. These are necessary elements of a claim for negligent interference with prospective economic advantage. North American Chemical Co. v. Superior Court, 59 Cal. App. 4th 764, 786 (1997); see also Youst v. Longo, 43 Cal. 3d 64, 71 n.6 (1987).
- 2. Plaintiff's cause of action for violation of the Fair Credit Billing Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1666(a)(B)(ii), fails to state a claim for relief against Homeg, and should be dismissed with prejudice. The Act regulates the relationship between a creditor and an obligor when a dispute arises about a periodic statement sent by the creditor to the obligor. Here, there are no allegations that Homeg sent Plaintiff any kind of statement. Rather, Plaintiff alleges that at some point in time he was denied financing from a lender, allegedly because Homeq had reported a prior delinquency on an earlier loan to Plaintiff. These circumstances do not come within the Fair Credit Billing Act cited by Plaintiff.
- 3. Plaintiff's complaint specifically relies on an October 9, 2007 letter from Homeq to Plaintiff. When ruling on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the Court may consider certain materials other than the complaint itself without converting the

motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment. *US v. Ritchie*, 342 F.3d 903, 908 (9th Cir. 2003); *Parrino v. FHP, Inc.*, 146 F.3d 699, 706 (9th Cir. 1998). "[A] document is not 'outside' the complaint if the complaint *specifically refers to the document* and if its authenticity is not questioned." *Branch v. Tunnell*, 14 F.3d 449, 453 (9th Cir. 1994) (emphasis added); *Id.* at 454.

The Note states that payments are due on the first day of each month. Therefore, even assuming Plaintiff's allegations that Homeq reported Plaintiff's loan delinquent, any such reporting would in fact be correct, since payment August 31 for a payment due August 1 is 30 days late. Therefore, Plaintiff's own complaint, taken together with the documents that the Court may review in ruling on this motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), demonstrates that there was no incorrect credit reporting as to Plaintiff. Plaintiff therefore cannot allege sufficient facts under a cognizable legal theory against Homeq.

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant's motion to dismiss is GRANTED, and Plaintiff's complaint is hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date:			

Maxine M. Chesney United States District Judge

12

14

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within action. My business address is 9970 Research Drive, Irvine, California 92618.

On April 11, 2008, I served the following document described as:

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

On the following interested parties in this action:

Shawn Ridgell RIDGELL & LAWLOR LLP 2128 Broadway Oakland, CA 94612 (510) 986-1300

[X] VIA MAIL -- By placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope(s) addressed as above, and placing each for collection and mailing on the date following ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with my firm's business practice and collection and processing of mail with the United States Postal Service and correspondence placed for collection and mailing would be deposited with the United States Postal Service at Irvine, California, with postage thereon fully prepaid that same day in the ordinary course of business.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on April 11, 2008, at Irvine, California.

Sherie L. Cleeré